

TO: Dr. Roger Ritvo, VCAA
 From: Dr. Bayo Lawal, Dean, School of Sciences
 Date: December 3, 2004
 Subject: Comments requested by you



The following are my comments and report as requested in your e-mail of November 30, 2004.

Ever since I assumed the position of the Dean of the School of Sciences, Dr Chris Mahaffy, the Chair of the Physical Sciences Department (PHS) has consistently and deliberately trying to completely undermine my authority and ability to perform my job as dean of the school. I have enumerated some of the events I could below.

1. Sometime in September after our first or second Heads/Chairs meetings, Dr Mahaffy clandestinely called Ms. Cynthia Ellison up to his office to discuss and I quote 'matters that he does not want me to hear about', unquote. His meeting turned out to be complaints and making disparaging remarks about me. Some issues raised with Cynthia are:
 - That meetings were too short (our meetings last on average 1 hr: 25 mins) and he would prefer a longer period for our meetings.
 - I do not listen to him. (others will disagree with him on this)
 - I am in accessible in my office (a fact that can not be supported by other staff, faculty and chairs).

I consider, a chair inviting my secretary behind me to tell her things about me is most unprofessional and it was an attempt to turn the secretary against me, and thus encouraging insubordination.

2. I have asked all chairs at our meeting of September 4th, that I would like them each to schedule a faculty meeting and should be so kind to invite me to this meeting so that we can get to know each other better at each departmental level.

While Biology, Mathematics, Public Administration and Political Science, Psychology, and Justice and Public Safety chairs did not object to this, Dr. Mahaffy's immediate conversation with me a day after the meeting was that it would be very difficult for him to schedule such a meeting and that however, whenever he does schedule it, I will be invited (clearly an open-ended scenario).

I met with Biology, Mathematics and Public Administration and Political Science in September, and Psychology in mid October. I asked Cynthia to remind both chairs in JPS and Physical Sciences that I was yet to meet with them. Dr Mahaffy came to my office there after to raise a lot of issues. At this time, I mentioned the issue of him inviting my secretary to his office to talk about me and I hope that he fully understands the implications of such an action. It was then that he told me that the Jason project will not be continued this year.

At the chairs meeting that day (October 4, 2004), we all discussed the Jason Project and it was agreed that we should explore the possibility of getting money to run this and we all agreed that we should give the Dean till Thursday (10/7/04) to see if we can get some additional funding (I had volunteered to even fund a substantial part of the needed money if it will help run the project this year) and that Dr Mahaffy should leave that option open. We also suggested based on his argument that we could at least run a smaller version of it if all participating schools could not be brought on board at this hour. I also informed the meeting of my mentioning and reminding funding for this project to Vice Chancellors Jackie Roberts and Roger Ritvo the previous Friday after the new faculty and staff orientation meeting to which Jackie had promised to get back to me by Wednesday or Thursday the following week.

It was obvious at the meeting that Dr Mahaffy had no intention of giving the running of the project a chance because the second day, he came in to tell me that there is no way they 'the committee' could do this as Randy could not get the schools on phone. I went to Randy's office that afternoon on an unrelated issue and it was obvious to me that Dr Mahaffy did not want the event to take place this year.



The Wednesday of that week, I was off campus all morning and when I came back on Thursday, Dr Mahaffy came to my office at about 7:45 a.m. to inform me that he had talked to Jackie Roberts and she had mentioned that Dr Nance has available about \$2500.0 to be shared by several competing community outreach programs on campus. At this time, I asked why he could not wait for me to give him a feed back on an issue that the dean is currently pursuing via a memorandum. That protocol suggests that he not undercuts the dean, to which I was then barraged with lectures on how AUM has been operating for the past twenty or so years and that previous deans have not objected to this procedure. I had reminded him of our three previous chairs' meetings at which we have discussed procedures to follow when something is in process with the upper administration through the dean. Of course he was not satisfied with this approach and he eventually came on Friday that they could not run the Jason project to which I asked him to put it in writing for transmittal to Dr Ritvo.

3. As a consequence of our discussion on procedures in the last paragraph, he sent me and copied all chairs and all secretaries a memo on October 26 requesting for an item to be included on the next heads/chairs meeting. (see attachment I). I honestly do not know why an item for inclusion on our agenda being sent to Cynthia should be copied to all chairs and departmental secretaries. The motive was clear and at the meeting on November 1, it turned out that every body except Dr Mahaffy was well aware of the procedure in place which we have previously talked about at two of our previous meetings.

I realized after this incident that Dr Mahaffy was trying to engineer dissention, not only among the chairs but also among the secretaries who of course will in turn share information with faculty and staff.

4. Dr Mahaffy finally called a departmental meeting for Friday November 5 to which I was invited. At the meeting, we discussed issues relating to weekend college, research and publication as well as looking for opportunities for instrumentation grants from the NSF or similar foundations. Of course, the faculty led by Dr Mahaffy was not receptive to any of my suggestions and I suggested at the end of my meeting that we certainly need to talk more on these at a future date.

On the following Monday, Dr Mahaffy came into my office and his first words were 'He and the entire department faculty and staff were terribly disappointed in me' based on our conversation on Friday. He was as usual doing all the talking and started his usual lecture and when I asked him if I could respond or if at least he could give me the opportunity to say a few things, he retorted loudly (people outside my office could clearly hear him) 'That I just do not listen to people'. At this point, I have to tell him that the only time he considers me listening to him is if I allow him alone to do all the talking. He further retorted, "Dr Thomas for instance does not need to publish as he is not looking for promotion", so why do I think they are or would be interested in research?

Dr Mahaffy was very rude, condescending and I had to advise him whether he knows that since I have assumed this position, he has never seen any good that I have done and that he has been creating an hostile environment for me to work effectively and that he is threading a fine line. It was after this that he seemed to back down and I had to end the conversation because I had another appointment.

5. After going through the registration booklet for Spring 2005 for the School, I observed that General Chemistry I (a core course for all students in Chemistry, Biology and all pre-professional programs in the School) has only one section and it is being taught as a weekend college course, and even more so as an overload. Further the class will meet on Sundays from 12 noon to 8 p.m. and also as a nine week course. I feel that the students

- Have no choice but to register for this only section of the course
- That it is being taught between 12 noon and 8 p.m. on Sunday
- It is a nine week class (do students have any choice?)
- Why offer three section of General Chemistry II and only one of General Chemistry I since the former feeds from the latter. (registration now shows that the third weekend class should not have been scheduled as it has only 6 students registered to date)

- Finally, it is going to be taught as an overload by a faculty

Why I could not do anything about all the above for Spring 2005, I felt it was my responsibility that this again does not happen in Fall 2005. This prompted my memorandum to Dr Mahaffy on November 19 (see Attachment II)-where I raised some of these issues regarding the submitted proposed schedule for Fall 2005 from the department. The latter part of this memo has requested the chair to feel free to come and discuss the issues raised in this memo with the dean. The memo was copied to Dr Ritvo.

Later that afternoon, I had come back to pick my umbrella after I realized that it was drizzling outside (I was going for the Planning and Budget Meeting at 1:30 p.m.) when I saw Dr Mahaffy and Dr Jill Rawlings in my office wanting to see me regarding the issues raised in the memo. I told them that I was already late for a meeting and that if they would like to see me that afternoon, I would be back by 3 p.m. or it could wait until Monday. At first, I was told that 3 p.m. might not be suitable for Dr. Rawlings and I suggested Monday would be fine too. I said that in any case, I would be back by 3 p.m. To my surprise, when I came back from the meeting at about 3:15 p.m., I was told by Dr Glen Ray that Dr Mahaffy was very angry with me because I did not fulfill my 2 p.m. appointment to which I responded that I did not have a 2 p.m. but a 3 p.m. appointment but unfortunately, the meeting went beyond 3 p.m. and that Chris had gone home and wanted an apology from me. To which I responded, 'apology for what?'. I could not have given a 2 p.m. appointment because I know from experience that the 1:30 p.m. meeting will last at least one hour.

On Monday, I came to the office and opened my e-mail, and the first thing I saw was the e-mail to me and Dr Ritvo titled "Your memo/questions/comments on the PHS Fall 2005 Schedule" which he not only copied to all the chairs of the departments in the School but also to the entire faculty and staff of the school. The tone of the memo was not only uncivil but outrightly confrontational (see Attachment III). After reading the e-mail from Dr Ritvo and another from Dean Alan Hackel regarding weekend classes, I realized that there would not be a strong support for me on these issues to effect the changes I would like. Consequently, I invited Dr Mahaffy to my office on that Monday, November 22 for a meeting. At that meeting, also attended by Dr Rawlings, Dr Mahaffy brought a tape recorder and requested if he could tape our conversation to which I said no. After discussing the genesis of my initial memo and Dr Rawlings' explanation as to why she needs to schedule 12 week classes (in her written memo to me, attachment IV), I asked that the department could continue with their proposed schedule for Fall 2005. I further asked Dr Mahaffy why he would write his letter in such tone to which he apologized.

On knowingly to me, Dr Mahaffy got to his office the second day, November 23, sent an e-mail to all chairs (Attachment V) to declare 'victory'. This time he did not copy me because he obviously did not want me to know about it. The intention of this e-mail was quite clear.

My Observations.

- Dr Mahaffy seems bitter that I am in this position
- He certainly does not want me to succeed as he goes about to discredit me
- He keeps creating hostile environment for me
- He polarizes situations and marshals others to intimidate me (case in point, Dean of Continuing Education sending me a note and coming over to discuss issues relating to weekend college)
- He deliberately undermines me with all the chairs, the secretaries and faculty, especially those in his department except Dr Rawlings.
- He breaches the spirit of confidentiality
- It is increasingly clear that Dr Mahaffy does not want to work with me and if I am going to succeed in this job, and I intend to, I would have to take some actions to curtail this destructive and polarizing atmosphere that currently exists.

I have summarized some of the encounters above but I could not in any way summarize the agonizing effect, pains and mental abuse that his incessant assault upon me has caused. More so with his abusive and 'code language' in his writings and discussions.

I hope this will not happen again, but if it does, I will have no other avenue open to me than to exercise the authority of the office of the dean of the school.